

# Discrete Thermodynamic Bethe Ansatz

Michel Bergère<sup>+</sup>, Ken-Ichiro Imura<sup>++</sup> and Stéphane Ouvry<sup>++</sup>

<sup>+</sup> *Spht, CEA-Saclay*

<sup>++</sup> *LPTMS, Université Paris-Sud*

*bergere@spht.saclay.cea.fr; imura@ipno.in2p3.fr; ouvry@ipno.in2p3.fr*

(February 1, 2008)

## Abstract

We propose discrete TBA equations for models with discrete spectrum. We illustrate our construction on the Calogero-Moser model and determine the discrete 2-body TBA function which yields the exact  $N$ -body Calogero-Moser thermodynamics. We apply this algorithm to the Lieb-Liniger model in a harmonic well, a model which is relevant for the microscopic description of harmonically trapped Bose-Einstein condensates in one dimension. We find that the discrete TBA reproduces correctly the  $N$ -body groundstate energy of the Lieb-Liniger model in a harmonic well at first order in perturbation theory, but corrections do appear at second order.

## I. INTRODUCTION

It has been known for a long time that the spectrum of the Calogero model [1], defined here as particles on an infinite line interacting via  $\alpha(\alpha-1)/(x_i-x_j)^2$  2-body interactions, can be found [2] by the Bethe Ansatz (BA) which assumes periodic boundary conditions, and that its thermodynamics can be obtained, in the thermodynamic limit, by the Thermodynamic Bethe Ansatz (TBA) [3]. It is however not necessary to rely on the BA (or the TBA) to get the Calogero spectrum (or its thermodynamics). Indeed, the Calogero model is exactly solvable

- either by confining the particles in a harmonic well of frequency  $\omega$ : the Calogero-Moser model [4] with discretized harmonic well quantum numbers and energies, and Hamiltonian

$$H_N = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d^2}{dx_i^2} + \alpha(\alpha-1) \sum_{i<j} \frac{1}{(x_i-x_j)^2} + \frac{1}{2} \omega^2 x_i^2 \quad (1)$$

- or by confining the particles in a periodic box of length  $L$ : the Calogero-Sutherland model [5] with discretized momenta and energies, and Hamiltonian

$$H_N = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d^2}{dx_i^2} + \alpha(\alpha-1) \left(\frac{\pi}{L}\right)^2 \sum_{i<j} \frac{1}{\sin^2[\frac{\pi}{L}(x_i-x_j)]} \quad (2)$$

(the  $1/\sin^2[\pi(x_i-x_j)/L]$  interactions are nothing but the periodic version of the infinite line interactions). It is not a surprise that Bethe ansatz equations yield the Calogero-Sutherland spectrum, since they also assume, as stressed above, periodic boundary conditions.

Both parameters  $\omega$  and  $L$  can be considered as long distance regulators, the thermodynamic limit, i.e. the infinite line limit, being obtained either by  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  or  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , resulting in continuous momenta and energies.

The Calogero model describes particles with intermediate statistics, which is natural due to the topological (statistical) nature of the  $1/(x_i-x_j)^2$  interaction in 1d. In the thermodynamic limit indeed [6], the Calogero thermodynamics realizes microscopically Haldane (Hilbert space counting) statistics [7]. Moreover, the Calogero model has been shown to be obtained as the vanishing magnetic field limit [8] of the lowest Landau level anyon model [9]

(LLL-anyon model) in the regime where the flux tubes carried by the anyons screen the flux of the external magnetic field (screening regime). Not surprisingly, the LLL-anyon model also realizes microscopically Haldane statistics, the Hilbert space counting argument being manifest here via a mean field argument (adding anyons screen the external magnetic field, and thus diminish the Landau degeneracy of the total -mean+external- magnetic field): thus a clear relation between Haldane [10] and anyon statistics [11].

Starting from the BA spectrum, and following Yang and Yang footsteps [3], one can compute à la TBA the thermodynamics of the Calogero model in the thermodynamic limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . The thermodynamical potential  $\ln Z$  -where  $Z = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} z^N Z_N$  is the grand partition function- ends up to be those of a Fermi gas<sup>1</sup>

$$\log Z = \frac{L}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk \log[1 + ze^{-\beta\epsilon(k)}], \quad (3)$$

but with a 1-body energy  $\epsilon(k)$  defined in terms of the free continuous 1-body quadratic spectrum  $\epsilon_o(k) = k^2/2$  as

$$\beta\epsilon(k_1) = \beta\epsilon_o(k_1) - \frac{L}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk_2 \Phi(k_1 - k_2) \log[1 + ze^{-\beta\epsilon(k_2)}] \quad (4)$$

In the Calogero case [12],

$$\Phi(k_1 - k_2) = \frac{2\pi}{L} (1 - \alpha) \delta(k_1 - k_2) \quad (5)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>There is an equivalent formulation in terms of a free Bose gas, namely

$$\log Z = \frac{L}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk \log \frac{1}{1 - ze^{-\beta\tilde{\epsilon}(k)}},$$

but with a 1-body energy  $\tilde{\epsilon}(k)$  defined as

$$\beta\tilde{\epsilon}(k_1) = \beta\epsilon_o(k_1) - \frac{L}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk_2 \tilde{\Phi}(k_1 - k_2) \log \frac{1}{1 - ze^{-\beta\tilde{\epsilon}(k_2)}}$$

One has obviously

$$\tilde{\Phi}(k_1 - k_2) - \Phi(k_1 - k_2) = -\frac{2\pi}{L} \delta(k_1 - k_2)$$

is intimately related to the 2-body scattering angle, and encodes, if one thinks in terms of statistics, the statistical exclusion between two quantum states, here with the same momentum.

Note that if one denotes  $y(k) = 1 + ze^{-\beta\epsilon(k)}$ , which can be regarded, in view of (3), as the grand partition function at momentum  $k$ , then (4) can be rewritten as

$$y(k) - ze^{-\beta\epsilon_o(k)}y(k)^{1-\alpha} = 1 \quad (6)$$

a particular case of Ramanujan equations [13].

As already said, equations of the type (3,6) were first obtained directly by i) considering the exact  $N$ -body Calogero spectrum in a harmonic well [6], or by considering the exact  $N$ -body LLL-anyon spectrum in a harmonic well [9], ii) and then taking the thermodynamic limit.

Now we might ask the following question: are the TBA equations (3,4) specific to the thermodynamic limit with continuous momenta and continuous dressed energies, or can they also describe the thermodynamic of the Calogero model in a harmonic well or in a periodic box with discretized energies? In other words, can we find a discretized version of the function  $\Phi(k_1 - k_2)$  in (5) such that the harmonic well or periodic box Calogero thermodynamics narrow down to a set of defining equations analogous to (3,4)?

We will show that the thermodynamic of the Calogero model in a harmonic well can indeed be rewritten “à la TBA” in terms of a discretized function  $\Phi$  which will encode the statistical Calogero exclusion between different discrete harmonic energy levels and which will, as it should, reproduce, in the thermodynamic limit  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\Phi(k_1 - k_2)$  in (5). Not surprisingly, the same conclusion will be reached for the LLL-anyon model in an harmonic well, whose thermodynamics will obey the same TBA equations as the Calogero-Moser thermodynamics.

We will also argue that the same logic applies in the Calogero-Sutherland case, provided that a global shift of the bare quantum numbers is made in order to maintain a symmetric repartition of the dressed quantum numbers around zero.

Finally, we will look at possible applications of discrete TBA thermodynamics beyond the Calogero-Moser and harmonic LLL-anyon cases, by considering the Lieb-Liniger model in a harmonic well [14], [15]. This model is interesting because of its relevance to the description of one dimensional trapped Bose condensates [16]. We will show that the  $N$ -body groundstate energy is correctly reproduced at first order in perturbation theory by the discrete TBA equations, but corrections do appear at second order.

## II. THE CALOGERO CASE

For a system with a discrete 1-body harmonic spectrum, the TBA equations (3,4) should rewrite quite generally as

$$\log Z = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \log[1 + ze^{-\beta\epsilon(n)}], \quad (7)$$

where the 1-body dressed energy  $\epsilon(n)$  should now be defined in terms of the 1-body 1d harmonic spectrum (bare spectrum)  $\epsilon_o(n) = (n + 1/2)\omega$ ,  $0 \leq n$  as

$$\beta\epsilon(n_1) = \beta\epsilon_o(n_1) - \sum_{n_2=0}^{\infty} \Phi_{n_1, n_2} \log[1 + ze^{-\beta\epsilon(n_2)}] \quad (8)$$

(7,8) are just the discretized versions of (3,4). In (8),  $\Phi_{n_1, n_2}$  has to be understood as acting on the free harmonic spectrum, i.e as acting on the power series in  $z$  obtained from (8) by expanding  $y(n) = 1 + ze^{-\beta\epsilon(n)}$  as

$$y(n) = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} y_N(n) z^N \quad (9)$$

The lowest order terms of (9) are

$$\begin{aligned} y_0(n_1) &= 1, \\ y_1(n_1) &= e^{-\beta\epsilon_o(n_1)}, \\ y_2(n_1) &= \sum_{n_2=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta\epsilon_o(n_1)} \Phi_{n_1, n_2} e^{-\beta\epsilon_o(n_2)}, \\ y_3(n_1) &= \sum_{n_2, n_3=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta\epsilon_o(n_1)} \left( \Phi_{n_1, n_2} e^{-\beta\epsilon_o(n_2)} \Phi_{n_2, n_3} + \frac{1}{2} \Phi_{n_1, n_2} e^{-\beta\epsilon_o(n_2)} \Phi_{n_1, n_3} \right) e^{-\beta\epsilon_o(n_3)} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n_2=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta\epsilon_o(n_1)} \Phi_{n_1, n_2} e^{-2\beta\epsilon_o(n_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $0 \leq n_1, n_2, \dots$  and the summation should be taken for all possible independant integers  $n_2, n_3, \dots$ .

If the TBA cluster coefficients obtained from expanding  $\log Z = \sum b_n z^n$

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} y_1(n), \\ b_2 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left[ y_2(n) - \frac{1}{2} y_1^2(n) \right], \\ b_3 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left[ y_3(n) - y_1(n) y_2(n) + \frac{1}{3} y_1^3(n) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

have to match against the Calogero-Moser cluster coefficients  $b_1 = \frac{e^{-\frac{\beta\omega}{2}}}{1-e^{-\beta\omega}}$ ,  $b_2 = e^{-\beta\omega} \left[ \frac{e^{-\beta\omega\alpha} - e^{-\beta\omega}}{(1-e^{-2\beta\omega})(1-e^{-\beta\omega})} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1-e^{-2\beta\omega}} \right]$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $\Phi_{n_1, n_2}$  should be defined as

$$\Phi_{n_1, n_2} = P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha) - P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha = 1) \quad (12)$$

where  $P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha)$  projects the two independant quantum numbers  $0 \leq n_1, n_2$  on dressed quantum numbers which, not surprisingly, obey exclusion statistics. More precisely, evaluating in (7,8,10) expressions of the type

$$\sum_{n_2=0}^{\infty} P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha) e^{-\beta\epsilon(n_2)}, \quad (13)$$

$P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha)$  amounts,  $n_1$  being given, to the shift

$$n_2 \rightarrow n_1 + \tilde{n}_2 + \alpha, \quad \tilde{n}_2 \geq 0 \quad (14)$$

and the summation over  $n_2$  is replaced by the summation over  $\tilde{n}_2 \geq 0$ . In other words, in terms of the independant quantum numbers  $0 \leq n_1, n_2$ , denoting  $\mathbf{n}_1 = n_1$ ,  $\mathbf{n}_2 = n_1 + \tilde{n}_2$ ,  $P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha)$  means  $n_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{n}_1$ , and  $n_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{n}_2 + \alpha$ , where  $0 \leq \mathbf{n}_1 \leq \mathbf{n}_2$  are now bosonic quantum numbers. Therefore  $P_{n_1, n_2}(0)$  projects  $0 \leq n_1, n_2$  onto bosonic quantum numbers  $0 \leq \mathbf{n}_1 \leq \mathbf{n}_2$ , whereas  $P_{n_1, n_2}(1)$  projects  $0 \leq n_1, n_2$  onto fermionic quantum numbers. Note that in (12) subtracting  $P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha = 1)$  is simply a matter of convention, i.e. as stressed above, a fermionic thermodynamical potential (3) with a spectrum which has to coincide with the bare spectrum when  $\alpha = 1$  -the Bose convention would yield  $\tilde{\Phi}_{n_1, n_2} = P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha) - P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha = 0)$ .

More generally notice that (12) allows to rewrite (8) as

$$y(n_1) - ze^{-\beta\epsilon_o(n_1)} \frac{\prod_{\tilde{n}_2=0}^{\infty} y(n_1 + \tilde{n}_2 + \alpha)}{\prod_{\tilde{n}_2=0}^{\infty} y(n_1 + \tilde{n}_2 + 1)} = 1 \quad (15)$$

which can be viewed as the discretized version of (6).

Going one step further one gets

$$\prod_{\tilde{n}_2=0}^{\infty} y(n_1 + \tilde{n}_2) = \prod_{\tilde{n}_2=0}^{\infty} y(n_1 + \tilde{n}_2 + 1) + ze^{-\beta\epsilon_o(n_1)} \prod_{\tilde{n}_2=0}^{\infty} y(n_1 + \tilde{n}_2 + \alpha) \quad (16)$$

which in turn, taken at  $n_1 = 0$ , rewrites as

$$Z = ze^{-\beta\epsilon_o(0)} \prod_{\tilde{n}_2=0}^{\infty} y(\tilde{n}_2 + \alpha) + \prod_{\tilde{n}_2=0}^{\infty} y(\tilde{n}_2 + 1) \quad (17)$$

Equation (17) can be interpreted by saying that either the first particle is in the ground-state at energy  $\frac{1}{2}\omega$  and then the next particle is in the energy level at least higher than  $(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha)\omega$ , or the groundstate is vacant and the first particle is in the energy level at least higher than  $(\frac{1}{2} + 1)\omega$ . One verifies recursively that  $Z$  in (17) is identical to the grand partition of the Calogero-Moser model with  $N$ -body spectrum

$$E_N = \omega \sum_{i=1}^N \left( [\mathbf{n}_i + \alpha(i-1)] + \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (18)$$

where  $0 \leq \mathbf{n}_1 \leq \mathbf{n}_2 \leq \dots$ . In terms of the bare independent quantum numbers  $0 \leq n_1, n_2, \dots$ , one has  $n_i \rightarrow \mathbf{n}_i + \alpha(i-1) = n_{i-1} + \tilde{n}_i + \alpha(i-1)$  with  $\tilde{n}_i \geq 0$ . This is indeed a BA “like” spectrum, i.e. in terms of the dressed quantum numbers  $\mathbf{n}'_i = \mathbf{n}_i + \alpha(i-1)$ , one has  $\mathbf{n}'_i = \mathbf{n}_i + \alpha \sum_{j \neq i} \theta(\mathbf{n}'_i - \mathbf{n}'_j)$ . In the 2-body case, it indeed amounts to  $n_1 \rightarrow n_1, n_2 \rightarrow n_1 + \tilde{n}_2 + \alpha$ , i.e. to the action of the projector  $P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha)$  on the independent quantum numbers  $0 \leq n_1, n_2$ .

Note that (12) implies that the  $N$ -body partition function  $Z_N$  obtained from (7) as

$$Z_N = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} y_{N_n}(n), \quad 0 \leq N_n, \quad \sum_n N_n = N \quad (19)$$

has, using (10) to all orders, the simple factorized form

$$Z_N = \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_N=0}^{\infty} P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha) P_{n_2, n_3}(\alpha) \dots P_{n_{N-1}, n_N}(\alpha) e^{-\beta(\epsilon_o(n_1) + \epsilon_o(n_2) + \dots + \epsilon_o(n_N))} \quad (20)$$

In particular in the 2-body case

$$Z_2 - Z_2|_{Fermi} = \sum_{n_1, n_2=0}^{\infty} (P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha) - P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha = 1)) e^{-\beta(\epsilon_o(n_1) + \epsilon_o(n_2))} \quad (21)$$

and thus in the thermodynamic limit<sup>2</sup>  $\omega \rightarrow 0$

$$Z_2 - Z_2|_{Fermi} = \left(\frac{L}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk_1 dk_2 \Phi(k_1 - k_2) e^{-\beta(\frac{k_1^2}{2} + \frac{k_2^2}{2})} \quad (26)$$

where  $\Phi$  is given in (5).

As far as the LLL-anyon model in a harmonic well [9] is concerned, one finds that (7,8,12) are unchanged, to the exception of the 1-body energy which now reads  $\epsilon_o(n) = (\omega_t - \omega_c)n + \omega_c$ , where  $\omega_c = eB/2$ ,  $\omega_t = \sqrt{\omega_c^2 + \omega^2}$ , and the statistical anyonic parameter has to be understood as being  $-\alpha$ , i.e. the screening regime where the flux  $\phi = -\alpha\phi_o$  ( $\phi_o$  is the quantum of flux) carried by each anyon is antiparallel to the external magnetic field.

One can easily convince oneself that in the thermodynamic limit  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , both the Calogero and LLL-anyon TBA thermodynamics narrow down to

---

<sup>2</sup>By factorizing the center of mass, (21) rewrites as

$$Z_2 - Z_2|_{Fermi} = \frac{1}{2 \sinh \frac{\beta\omega}{2}} \sum_{\tilde{n}_2=2l \geq 0} \left( e^{-\beta\omega(\tilde{n}_2 + \frac{1}{2} + \alpha)} - e^{-\beta\omega(\tilde{n}_2 + \frac{1}{2} + 1)} \right) \quad (22)$$

and (26) as

$$Z_2 - Z_2|_{Fermi} = \left(\frac{L}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dK e^{-\beta \frac{K^2}{4}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk \Phi(2k) e^{-\beta k^2} \quad (23)$$

Since, in the thermodynamic limit [17] for the  $N$ -th cluster coefficient,  $\frac{1}{\beta\omega} \rightarrow \frac{L}{\sqrt{2\pi\beta}} \sqrt{N}$ , one infers that in the 2-body case

$$\frac{1}{2 \sinh \frac{\beta\omega}{2}} \rightarrow \frac{L}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dK e^{-\beta \frac{K^2}{4}} \quad (24)$$

and therefore one should have

$$\sum_{\tilde{n}_2=2l \geq 0} \left( e^{-\beta\omega(\tilde{n}_2 + \frac{1}{2} + \alpha)} - e^{-\beta\omega(\tilde{n}_2 + \frac{1}{2} + 1)} \right) \rightarrow \frac{L}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk \Phi(2k) e^{-\beta k^2} \quad (25)$$

a result that can be trivially checked by direct computation.



$$\log Z = \int_0^\infty d\epsilon_o \rho_o(\epsilon_o) \ln(1 + ze^{-\beta\epsilon(\epsilon_o)}) \quad (27)$$

where the dressed energy  $\epsilon(\epsilon_o)$  is implicitly defined à la TBA in terms of the bare energy  $\epsilon_o$  as

$$\beta\epsilon = \beta\epsilon_o - \int_0^\infty d\epsilon' \Phi(\epsilon, \epsilon') \ln(1 + ze^{-\beta\epsilon'}) \quad (28)$$

and

$$\Phi(\epsilon, \epsilon') = (1 - \alpha)\delta(\epsilon - \epsilon') \quad (29)$$

Here,  $\rho_o(\epsilon_o)$  is the 1-body density of states of the bare spectrum of the system considered, i.e. in the Calogero case the 1d free density of states  $\rho_o(\epsilon_o) = L/(\pi\sqrt{2\epsilon_o})$ , and, in the LLL-anyon case, the 2d LLL density of states,  $\rho_o(\epsilon_o) = (BV/\phi_o)\delta(\epsilon_o - \omega_c)$ , where  $V$  is now the infinite surface of the 2d plane.

In the case of the Calogero model in a periodic box -the Calogero-Sutherland model-, one can still propose (7) and (8), but now the 1-body dressed energy  $\epsilon(n)$  should be defined in terms of the 1-body spectrum in a 1d periodic box of length  $L$ ,  $\epsilon_o(n) = k^2/2$ , with discretized momentum  $k = 2\pi n/L$  and  $n$  positive, null or negative integer.

However, and contrary to the harmonic case, the very fact that the bare quantum numbers in a periodic box can be of both signs lead to some adjustments. If one looks at the  $N$ -body Calogero-Sutherland spectrum<sup>3</sup>

$$E_N = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{2\pi}{L} \right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \left( [\mathbf{n}_i + \alpha(i-1)] - \alpha \frac{(N-1)}{2} \right)^2 \quad (30)$$

where  $\mathbf{n}_1 \leq \mathbf{n}_2 \leq \dots$ , one finds that in terms of the bare quantum numbers  $n_i \rightarrow \mathbf{n}_i + \alpha(i-1) - \alpha(N-1)/2 = n_{i-1} + \tilde{n}_i + \alpha(i-1) - \alpha(N-1)/2$  with  $\tilde{n}_i \geq 0$ . This is quite similar to the Calogero-moser spectrum, up to a global shift,  $n_i \rightarrow n_i - \alpha(N-1)/2$ , a  $N$ -dependant periodic boundary condition adjustment insuring that the dressed spectrum

---

<sup>3</sup>with a BA spectrum  $\mathbf{n}'_i = \mathbf{n}_i + \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} \text{sign}(\mathbf{n}'_i - \mathbf{n}'_j)$

remain symmetric around 0 in order to minimize the  $N$ -body energy. In the 2-body case  $n_1 \rightarrow n_1 - \alpha/2, n_2 \rightarrow n_1 + \tilde{n}_2 + \alpha/2$ , it amounts to the action of the Calogero-Moser projector  $P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha)$  as given in (12) on the a priori two independent quantum numbers  $n_1, n_2$ , again up to the 2-body shift  $n_{1,2} \rightarrow n_{1,2} - \alpha/2$ . This being considered, altogether with the fact that the Calogero-Moser and Calogero-Sutherland models originate from the same model, up to a long distance regularisation, it is natural to take for both models the same TBA function (12) to obtain, in view of (20), the correct Calogero-Sutherland  $N$ -body partition function, but in addition the shift  $n_i \rightarrow n_i - \alpha(N-1)/2$  has to be made a posteriori.

At this point, one can remark that in all cases studied so far, the Calogero-Moser model, as well as the Calogero-Sutherland model up to periodic boundary conditions adjustments, and their thermodynamic limit, the Calogero model, the TBA functions  $\Phi_{n_1, n_2}$  and  $\Phi(k_1 - k_2)$  are intimately related to the relative 2-boson density of states for the problem at hand. Indeed, in a harmonic well, the spectrum for a relative particle with bosonic statistics and interacting with a Calogero potential at the origin is

$$\epsilon = \omega(n + \frac{1}{2} + \alpha) \quad 0 \leq n \quad (31)$$

with  $n$  even, i.e. with symmetric eigenstates under  $x \rightarrow -x$ .

Let us first consider, in the thermodynamic limit, the Calogero model: when  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , the relative 2-boson density of states reads

$$\rho_\alpha(\epsilon) - \rho_{\alpha=1}(\epsilon) = \frac{1-\alpha}{2} \delta(\epsilon) \quad (32)$$

It rewrites in terms of the relative momentum  $k$  such that  $\epsilon = k^2$

$$\rho_\alpha(k) - \rho_{\alpha=1}(k) = \frac{1-\alpha}{2} \delta(k) \quad (33)$$

Now one has to map the relative 2-body momentum  $k$  on the “momentum”  $k_2 - k_1$  the function  $\Phi(k_2 - k_1)$  is concerned with. Since  $k_2 - k_1 = 2k$ , one gets for the density of states in terms of  $k_2 - k_1$

$$\rho_\alpha(\frac{k_2 - k_1}{2}) - \rho_{\alpha=1}(\frac{k_2 - k_1}{2}) = (1-\alpha) \delta(k_2 - k_1) \quad (34)$$

i.e. precisely (5) up to a factor  $2\pi/L$ .

When  $\omega$  is kept finite, the same logic applies: the relative spectrum (31) yields

$$n \rightarrow n + \alpha \quad (35)$$

One has yet to map the relative 2-body bosonic even quantum number  $n$  on the “quantum number”  $n_2 - n_1$  that the function  $\Phi_{n_1, n_2}$  is concerned with. For a given 2-body energy, i.e. for  $\mathbf{n}_1 + \mathbf{n}_2$  given, one has  $\mathbf{n}_2 - \mathbf{n}_1 = n$  -then the center of mass quantum number is  $2\mathbf{n}_1$ , or  $\mathbf{n}_2 - \mathbf{n}_1 = n + 1$  -then the center of mass quantum number is  $2\mathbf{n}_1 + 1$ , depending if  $\mathbf{n}_2 - \mathbf{n}_1$  is even or odd. One finds that  $n \rightarrow n + \alpha$  rewrites, in terms of the independent  $n_1, n_2$  as  $n_1 \rightarrow n_1, n_2 \rightarrow n_1 + \tilde{n}_2 + \alpha$ , where now  $\tilde{n}_2 = n$  or  $\tilde{n}_2 = n + 1$ , i.e. any positive integer. Then (35) is indeed identical to the action of  $\Phi_{n_1, n_2}$  in (12).

This is not a surprise, scattering 2-body phase shifts are known to be linked to the 2-body density of states via S-matrix arguments [18].

### III. THE LIEB-LINIGER CASE

In the Lieb-Liniger model in the thermodynamic limit, the same conclusion happens to be true. The model, defined as

$$H_N = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{d^2}{dx_i^2} + c \sum_{i < j} \delta(x_i - x_j) \quad (36)$$

is solvable by Bethe ansatz [14] and has a TBA thermodynamics [3] obtained from

$$\Phi(k_1 - k_2) = \frac{1}{L} \frac{2c}{(k_2 - k_1)^2 + c^2} \quad (37)$$

It interpolates between the Bose ( $c = 0$ ) and Fermi ( $c = \infty$ ) thermodynamics **and describes particles with intermediate statistics [15]**. For a relative particle with bosonic statistics interacting with a  $\delta$  potential at the origin the density of states is

$$\rho_c(\epsilon) - \rho_{c=\infty}(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{4\pi\sqrt{\epsilon}} \frac{c}{\epsilon + \frac{c^2}{4}} \quad (38)$$

which in terms of  $\epsilon = k^2, k > 0$  rewrites as

$$\rho_c(k) - \rho_{c=\infty}(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{c}{k^2 + \frac{c^2}{4}} \quad (39)$$

Now, one has again to map  $k$  on the “momentum”  $k_2 - k_1$  the function  $\Phi(k_1, k_2)$  is concerned with, i.e.  $k_2 - k_1 = 2k$ , and since  $k_2 - k_1$  can be either positive or negative, one gets for the density of states in terms of  $k_2 - k_1$

$$\rho_c\left(\frac{k_2 - k_1}{2}\right) - \rho_{c=\infty}\left(\frac{k_2 - k_1}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{2c}{(k_2 - k_1)^2 + c^2} \quad (40)$$

i.e. nothing but (37), again up to a factor  $2\pi/L$ .

If one follows the same line of reasoning which was operative in the Calogero-Moser case to obtain the discrete TBA function  $\Phi_{n_1, n_2}$  (12) from the relative 2-body spectrum (31), one might try, for the Lieb-Liniger model in a harmonic well, discrete TBA thermodynamics (7,8) equations with a TBA function  $\Phi_{n_1, n_2}$  deduced from the 2-body relative bosonic spectrum in a harmonic well [15]. It rewrites as

$$\epsilon = \omega \left( n + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \left( \frac{c}{2\sqrt{2\omega}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\epsilon}{2\omega} + \frac{1}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{\epsilon}{2\omega} + \frac{3}{4})} \right) \right) \quad 0 \leq n \quad (41)$$

with  $n$  even, i.e. as  $\epsilon = \omega(n + \frac{1}{2} + f_c(n))$  with<sup>4</sup>

$$0 \leq f_c(n) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \left( \frac{c}{2\sqrt{2\omega}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2} + \frac{f_c(n)}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n+2}{2} + \frac{f_c(n)}{2})} \right) \leq 1 \quad (43)$$

and interpolates between the relative 2-body bosonic ( $c = 0$ ,  $f_0(n) = 0$ ,  $g_0(n) = 1$ ) and fermionic ( $c = \infty$ ,  $f_\infty(n) = 1$ ,  $g_\infty(n) = 0$ ) spectra.

Therefore let us try for the Lieb and Liniger in a harmonic well the discrete TBA function

$$\Phi_{n_1, n_2} = P_{n_1, n_2}(c) - P_{n_1, n_2}(c = \infty) \quad (44)$$

should be defined in terms of  $P_{n_1, n_2}(c)$  such that,  $n_1$  being left unchanged,

---

<sup>4</sup>Equivalently, starting from the Fermi spectrum by rewriting  $f_c(n) = 1 - g_c(n)$

$$0 \leq g_c(n) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \left( \frac{2\sqrt{2\omega}}{c} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n+3}{2} - \frac{g_c(n)}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n+2}{2} - \frac{g_c(n)}{2})} \right) \leq 1 \quad (42)$$

$$n_2 \rightarrow n_1 + \tilde{n}_2 + f_c(\tilde{n}_2) \quad (45)$$

if  $\tilde{n}_2 \geq 0$  is even, and

$$n_2 \rightarrow n_1 + \tilde{n}_2 + f_c(\tilde{n}_2 - 1) \quad (46)$$

if  $\tilde{n}_2$  is odd. Note again that subtracting  $P_{n_1, n_2}(c = \infty)$  in (44) originates, as in the Calogero case, from the fermionic convention (obviously  $P_{n_1, n_2}(c = \infty) = P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha = 1)$ .)

It is easy to check that the 2-body partition function is reproduced by the discrete TBA equations

$$Z_2 - Z_2|_{Fermi} = \sum_{n_1=n_2=0}^{\infty} (P_{n_1, n_2}(c) - P_{n_1, n_2}(c = \infty)) e^{-\beta(\epsilon_o(n_1) + \epsilon_o(n_2))} \quad (47)$$

and thus, in the thermodynamic limit  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\sum_{\tilde{n}_2=2l \geq 0} \left( e^{-\beta(\tilde{n}_2 + \frac{1}{2} + f_c(\tilde{n}_2))} - (c = \infty) \right) \rightarrow \frac{L}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk \Phi(2k) e^{-\beta k^2} \quad (48)$$

where the function  $\Phi$  is given in (37), a result that can be checked by direct computation, order by order in  $1/c$ . There are two independant dimensionless parameters,  $\beta\omega$  (thermodynamic limit) and  $\sqrt{\beta}c$  (“coupling constant”). Clearly, for a given coupling constant  $\sqrt{\beta}c$ , looking at  $f_c(n) = 1 - g_c(n)$  in (43,42), one has to consider, in the thermodynamic limit  $\beta\omega \rightarrow 0$ , the spectrum close to the Fermi point ( $c = \infty$ ),

$$g_c(2l) = 4\sqrt{2} \frac{\sqrt{\beta\omega}}{\pi\sqrt{\beta}c} \frac{\Gamma(l + \frac{3}{2})}{l!} + \dots \quad (49)$$

from which (48) can be recovered, here at first order  $1/(\sqrt{\beta}c)$ .

Note also that in the thermodynamic limit for the relative spectrum, with  $(n + 1/2)\omega \rightarrow k^2$ , i.e.  $n\omega$  fixed, (43) becomes

$$f_c(k) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \frac{c}{2k} \quad (50)$$

which is indeed reminiscent of the Lieb and Liniger BA spectrum [14].

What about the  $N$ -body problem? A possible way to check the discrete TBA is to see if the perturbative TBA thermodynamics coincide with the exact (standard) Hamiltonian

perturbative thermodynamics [19], which can be computed with the Lieb and Liniger Hamiltonian from the Bose point  $c = 0$  (from the Fermi point  $c = \infty$  standard perturbation theory is meaningless). Perturbation theory yields

$$\log Z = \log Z|_{Bose} + \sqrt{\beta c} \sum_{s,t=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^{s+t}}{4\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\sqrt{\beta\omega}}{\sqrt{\sinh \frac{s\beta\omega}{2} \sinh \frac{t\beta\omega}{2} \sinh \frac{(s+t)\beta\omega}{2}}} + \dots \quad (51)$$

Let us now consider the  $\sqrt{\beta c}$  expansion from the TBA point of view, again from the Bose point. One has to consider (43) at first order in  $\sqrt{\beta c}$

$$f_c(2l) = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2}} \frac{\sqrt{\beta c}}{\sqrt{\beta\omega}} \frac{\Gamma(l + \frac{1}{2})}{l!} + \dots \quad (52)$$

and compute from the discrete TBA equations

$$\log Z = \log Z|_{Bose} + \sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} \frac{ze^{-\beta\omega(n_1+\frac{1}{2})}}{1 - ze^{-\beta\omega(n_1+\frac{1}{2})}} \sum_{n_2=0}^{\infty} \Phi_{n_1,n_2} \ln \frac{1}{1 - ze^{-\beta\omega(n_2+\frac{1}{2})}}|_1 + \dots \quad (53)$$

where  $\Phi_{n_1,n_2} \ln \frac{1}{1 - ze^{-\beta\omega(n_2+\frac{1}{2})}}|_1$  means evaluating this expression at first order in  $\sqrt{\beta c}$  using (52). One finds

$$\log Z = \log Z|_{Bose} + \sqrt{\beta c} \sum_{s,t=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^{s+t}}{4\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\sqrt{\beta\omega}}{\sinh \frac{(s+t)\beta\omega}{2}} \left( \sqrt{\coth \frac{s\beta\omega}{2}} + \sqrt{\coth \frac{t\beta\omega}{2}} \right) + \dots \quad (54)$$

which coincides with (51) only in the limit  $\beta\omega \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e. for a given  $\omega$ , in the zero temperature limit<sup>5</sup>, i.e the groundstate.

In fact, discrete TBA gives in the vanishing temperature limit direct information on the  $N$ -body groundstate energy : in the Calogero-Moser case, it is obtained, in the bosonic based formulation, by restricting the discrete TBA equations

$$\log Z = \sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} \log \frac{1}{1 - ze^{-\beta\epsilon(n_1)}}, \quad (55)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>The limit  $\omega \rightarrow \infty$  for a given temperature is not considered here. In this limit all particles are confined at  $x_i = 0$ . But  $\delta$  interactions actually forbid this unless the effective coupling constant vanishes, which is precisely happening in the 2-body case (43). In other words the  $\omega \rightarrow \infty$  limit is the trivial bosonic limit.

$$\beta\tilde{\epsilon}(n_1) = \beta\epsilon_o(n_1) - \sum_{n_2=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\Phi}_{n_1, n_2} \log \frac{1}{1 - ze^{-\beta\tilde{\epsilon}(n_2)}} \quad (56)$$

with  $\tilde{\Phi}_{n_1, n_2} = P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha) - P_{n_1, n_2}(\alpha = 0)$  to the groundstate quantum numbers  $n_1 = 0$  and  $\tilde{n}_2 = 0$ . One obtains

$$E_N^{G.S.} = \omega \left( \frac{N}{2} + \frac{N(N-1)}{2} \alpha \right) \quad (57)$$

In the Lieb and Liniger case a similar approach gives

$$E_N^{G.S.} = \omega \left( \frac{N}{2} + \frac{N(N-1)}{2} f_c(0) \right) \quad (58)$$

a result which is consistent with the groundstate energy at first order in  $c$

$$E_N^{G.S.} = \omega \left( \frac{N}{2} + \frac{N(N-1)}{2} f_c^{(1)}(0)c + \dots \right) \quad (59)$$

where  $f_c^{(1)}(0) = 1/\sqrt{2\pi\omega}$  stands for the first order term in the expansion of  $f_c(0)$  in power of  $c$ . However, second order standard perturbation theory gives corrections to the Calogero-Moser like energy  $\omega N(N-1)f_c(0)/2$ . For example in the  $N = 3$  case

$$E_3^{G.S.} = \omega \left( \frac{3}{2} + 3f_c^{(1)}(0)c + 3 \left( f_c^{(2)}(0) - \frac{1}{\pi\omega} \log \frac{4}{2 + \sqrt{3}} \right) c^2 + \dots \right) \quad (60)$$

where  $f_c^{(2)}(0) = -\frac{\log 2}{2\pi\omega}$  stands for the second order term in the expansion of  $f_c(0)$ .

#### IV. CONCLUSION

We have shown how the Calogero-Moser thermodynamics can be rewritten in terms of discrete TBA equations. In the Calogero-Sutherland model, the same TBA equations were shown to be operative, up to a global shift of the bosonic quantum numbers. Since the Lieb-Liniger model shares common features with the Calogero model -BA solvability, TBA thermodynamics in the thermodynamic limit, intermediate statistics- it might also have, when considered in a harmonic well, a discrete TBA thermodynamics. We tried to illustrate this point of view by proposing discrete TBA equations for the harmonic Lieb and Liniger

model in analogy with the Calogero-Moser TBA thermodynamics. However the groundstate energy shows deviations from this TBA framework at second order in perturbation theory.

We leave to a further study to find analytical or numerical ways to improve and give a stronger basis to the discrete TBA thermodynamics for the Lieb-Liniger model, and in particular extract a useful information on the groundstate for a given density of particles. It would however certainly be interesting to understand more in detail the zero temperature limit of a system which is supposed to describe the physics of 1d Bose Einstein condensates in harmonic traps.

Acknowledgements: One of us (S.O.) would like to thank S. Matvenkoo for useful discussions.



## REFERENCES

- [1] F. Calogero, J. Math. Phys. **10**, 2191 (1969); *ibid.* **12**, 419 (1971).
- [2] for a recent review on the subject and references see A. P. Polychronakos, in Les Houches Lecture Notes, Session LXIX, “Topological Aspects of Low-dimensional Systems” (1998) Ed. Springer; see also V. E. Korepin et al, “Quantum Inverse scattering method and correlation functions” (1993) Cambridge monographs on mathematical physics.
- [3] C. N. Yang and C.P. Yang, J. Math. Phys. **10**, 1115 (1969).
- [4] J. Moser, Adv. Math. **16**, 1 (1975).
- [5] B. Sutherland, J. Math. Phys. **12**, 246(1971); *ibid.* 251 (1971); Phys. Rev. **A4**, 2019 (1971); *ibid.* **A5**, 1372 (1972).
- [6] S. B. Isakov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A9**, 2563 (1994).
- [7] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 937 (1991); M. C. Bergère, JMP 41, 7252 (2000).
- [8] S. Ouvry, cond-mat/9907239, Phys. Lett. B (to be published)
- [9] A. Dasnières de Veigy and S. Ouvry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 600 (1994).
- [10] Y.-S. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 922 (1994); S. B. Isakov, Mod. Phys. Lett. **B8**, 319 (1994).
- [11] J. M. Leinaas, J. Myrheim, Nuovo Cimento B37, 1 (1977); F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 1144 (1982); 49, 957 (1982).
- [12] D. Bernard, in les Houches Lecture Notes, Session LXII (1994), Ed. North Holland; D. Bernard and Y.S. Wu, in Proc. 6th Nankai Workshop, eds. M.L. Ge and Y.S. Wu, World Scientific (1995).
- [13] M. V. N. Murthy and R. Shankar, IMSc/99/01/01 report.
- [14] E. H. Lieb and W. Liniger, Phys. Rev. **130**, 1605 (1963).

- [15] J. Myrheim, in Les Houches Lecture Notes, Session LXIX, “Topological Aspects of Low-dimensional Systems” (1998) Ed. Springer.
- [16] M. Oshanii, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 938 (1998); D. S. Petrov et al, cond-mat 0006339: V. Dunjko et al, cond-mat/0103085.
- [17] A. Dasnières de Veigy and S. Ouvry, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 352 (1995); K. Olaussen, Trondheim preprint (1992)
- [18] M. G. Krein, Matem. Sbornik, 33, 597 (1953); J. Friedel, Nuovo Cimento Suppl. 7, 287 (1958); Philos. Mag. 43, 153 (1953).
- [19] for the formalism used see A. Dasnieres de Veigy and S. Ouvry, Nucl. Phys. B 388 [FS], 715 (1992).